WASHINGTON POST
23 AUG 1971

STAT

Revolt Against Bundy as Editor

Furor at 'Foreign Affairs'

By Stephen Isaacs
Washington Post Staff Writer

NEW YORK—The "old boy" network of the Eastern Establishment has been twitching nervously for the last few months over the appointment of one of its own —William P. Bundy—to edit the prestigious quarterly Foreign Affairs.

Because of Bundy's Vietnam war policy-making position as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs in the Johnson administration, his selection as editor has set off a controversy involving many of the biggest names of the Eastern intellectual and corporate structure.

Bundy himself says that he is taking it philosophically. But he has been stung.

"The tactics, the degrees and types of attacks, and the demagoguery involved are at a very high level" of intensity, he says. Indeed, he calls them "McCarthyite in flavor. I resent the fact that I am being accused of immorality.

"We were probably quite wrong in all this," he said, referring to his role in the making of Vietnam war policy, "but certainly we're honest."

Other principals in the Foreign Affairs controversy include David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger, Bill Moyers, John McCloy, George Ball, Cral Kaysen, Jerome Wiesner, Francis Bator, Richard Falk and a sizeable proportion of the social studies faculties of places like Harvard, Yale, Princeton and MIT.

Bundy's younger brother McGeorge, who was an aide to President Johnson and now is president of the Ford Foundation, has stayed on the sidelines.

The arena is the New York-based Council of Foreign Relations, whose nearly 1,500 members represent the East's intellectual and corporate power in the realm of foreign policy.

Just how important the council and its quarterly magazine, Foreign Affairs, are to American foreign policy is a subject of some debate. Newsweek magazine, several years ago, said that Foreign Affair was—despite its small circulation, now 70,000—"one of the most influential periodicals in print."

The council's retiring executive director, George S. Franklin Jr., points to such things as the council's studies on mainland China as perhaps being influential in the new U.S. attitude. He mentions that Henry Kissinger's book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," was published by the council in 1957.

But others will say that the council as an organization now has less muscle than one George Meany—although as individuals, many of its members do represent the established money and brains of the East Coast.

That is what bothers the critics of Bundy's appointment. The attempt to dislodge Bundy from his new job was instigated by Princeton Law Prof. Richard A. Falk, who says, "This whole appointment stresses the continuity of American foreign policy where there should be an attempt to break with it. This illustrates the coherence of the elite.

"The small elite that runs (the council) is so insulated that they had no idea of what the impact would be" of naming Bundy.

The council had begun in the fall of 1969 to look for a new editor of Foreign Affairs to take over in the fall of 1972, after Hamilton Fish Armstrong publishes the quarterly's 50th anniversary edition. Armstrong, now 78, has edited the magazine for most of its existence. Seven months later, the council began looking for a replacement for Franklin when he announced his intent to resign—a job that ultimately went to Stanford Law Dean Bayless Manning.

Among those considered for either or both jobs were former Johnson administration aides Bill D. Moyers and James C. Thomson Jr.; Max Frankel of The New York Times and Henry Kissinger of the White House. All four said no.

Bundy, now at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Affairs, also was considered for both jobs. In a meeting with David Rockefeller at the home of then-Harvard President Nathan Pusey in November, 1970, Bundy said he would be interested in an offer to edit Foreign Affairs.

The council announced last March that Bundy would become Foreign Affairs' new editor. Soon thereafter, Falk and three other members of the council appealed to the council's board to rescind the decision.

The other three are Richard J. Barnett, co-director of the Institute for Political Studies in Washington, author Ronald Steel and Richard Ullman, associate dean of Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School. Publication of the Pentagon papers, highlighting Bundy's role in Vietnam policymaking, added fuel to their protests.

John McCloy, then chairman of the board, named a committee to meet with the dissidents, which it did on two occasions. Many hand-wringing sessions of board members followed.

Then, two weeks ago, Rockefeller, by now the new chairman of the board, sent a memorandum to the council's membership, telling of the challenge to Bundy but reaffirming the board's original decision.

Rockefeller's memo quoted Falk as saying:

"Mr. Bundy's role in planning and executing illegal and criminal war policies in Indochina should disqualify him, at least for a period of years, from holding an editorial position of this kind. To reward a former governmental official who was deceitful toward the public and Congress in this way is to undermine all notions of democratic accountability and directly contradicts the entire Nuremberg tradition that the United States did so much to evolve."

Although the board voted to stick with Bundy, several members say privately that the board failed to dig deeply enough into Bundy's role in Vietnam policy before it originally voted him the job.

These members, at least, say that if they knew then what they know now, they would not have chosen him. Their fear is not that Bundy will be a poor editor, but that his controversiality will preclude the kind of objectivity that has led Foreign Affairs to publish such varied authors as Nikita Khrushchev, John F. Kennedy, Anthony Eden, Konrad Adenauer, Jawaharlal Nehru, Josip Tito and Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Falk and Barnett say they don't question Bundy's editing ability or his objectivity, but they do question "rewarding" the man with the job, and question whether authors who disagreed strongly with Bundy over Vietnam would want to submit manuscripts to such an editor.

Says Barnett:

"I thought that the appointment was very important symbolically to the extent that the council is important to the country—this was a man who was willing consistently—despite evidence of some private doubts . . . who was willing to service this policy . . . to put great effort and energy into deceiving the Congress, into deceiving the public . . . He displayed a pattern of conduct which is criminal."

Barnett disagrees that his protest echoes of McCarthyism: "This is totally different. He (McCarthy) was making irresponsible charges. All we're saying is that we should see whether these charges are responsible.

"McCarthyism isn't the issue. The issue is whether this is more than bad judgment about a particular policy. It's a very serious question for the council and for the country."

He stresses that he is not trying to deny Bundy his job at MIT—just the one at Foreign Affairs. "He is the wrong man at the wrong time for this job."

Bundy, who notes with irony that he was once the